

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.

64

Press

Mis.

Dated

18—2—1882

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
18th February 1862.*

Read the following papers:—

No. 41. From Messrs. RITCHIE and SHAW; to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 29th January 1862.

We have the honor to forward the enclosed petition of Cassi Doss, Soucar, and to request you will lay the same before His Excellency the Governor in Council at your earliest convenience.

To His Excellency the Right Honorable Sir W. T. DENISON, K.C.B., Governor of Fort Saint George and President of the Council thereof, and the Honorable the Councillors.
&c., &c., &c.

The humble Petition of CASSI DOSS of Madras, Soucar.

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

That in the year one thousand eight hundred and thirty-nine Misbah Oollah Khan Bahadoor Moolta Azeem Jung was employed as Naib Khansamah or Deputy Steward of the Nabob's landed property at Hyderabad by the order of Prince Azeem Jah Bahadoor the Naib-i-Mooktear.

That some time in the year one thousand eight hundred and forty-four, His Highness the late Nabob of the Carnatic raised the said Misbah Oollah Khan Bahadoor to the office of Khansamah or Steward of such landed property at Hyderabad, and that he retained such office up to the time of the death of His late Highness.

That the said Misbah Oollah Khan Bahadoor was likewise employed by the said Nabob in several other capacities.

That whilst the said Misbah Oollah Khan Bahadoor was so employed he used to negotiate and raise loans some times in his own individual name and sometimes jointly with other Officers of the said Nabob for and on account of the said Nabob, and used to sign Promissory Notes for monies borrowed by him individually or jointly with any other Officers of the Nabob.

That among the monies so raised by the said Misbah Oollah Khan Bahadoor and other Office or Officers of the said Nabob for the said Nabob was a sum of Rupees one thousand received on the fifteenth July one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four from your Petitioner on a Promissory Note signed by the said Misbah Oollah Khan Bahadoor, one Ghoolam Mahomed and one Mahomed Inayet Oollah, which sum of Rupees one thousand your Petitioner paid to the said Misbah Oollah Khan and which sum was by the directions of the said Nabob expended by the said Misbah Oollah Khan in and about the purposes of the said Nabob, and the particulars of such expenditure were duly entered in the Dufters of the Circar kept by the Moonshee Aykbass.

That in the month of August one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four the said Misbah Oollah Khan paid your Petitioner the sum of one thousand Rupees borrowed from him on the fifteenth July one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four, by the order of the said Nabob.

That on the fourteenth of August one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four the said Misbah Oollah Khan again borrowed from your Petitioner Rupees one thousand and five hundred by the Nabob's directions and applied the same for the purposes of the said Nabob, and that such expenditure was duly entered in the said Dufters of the said Moonshee Aykbass.

That such sum of one thousand and five hundred Rupees was paid to your Petitioner when the said Note of the fourteenth August one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four became due from the monies of the said Nabob.

That on the fourteenth September one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four the said Misbah Oollah Khan again received from your Petitioner one thousand and five hundred Rupees as a fresh loan to the said Nabob on a Promissory Note executed by the said Misbah Oollah Khan and Ghoolam Mahomed and that such sum was applied for the Nabob's purposes and the particulars of the expenditure thereof were entered in the said Dufters of Moonshee Aykbass.

That such sum of one thousand and five hundred Rupees was paid to your Petitioner when the said Note of the fourteenth September one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four became due out of the monies of the said Nabob.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
18th February 1862.*

That on the twenty-sixth day of October one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four, the said Misbah Oollah Khan again received from your Petitioner Rupees one thousand and five hundred on a Promissory Note executed by him for the purposes of the said Nabob, and that such sum was applied for the purposes of the said Nabob and the particulars of such expenditure were entered in the Dufters of the said Nabob.

That such sum of one thousand and five hundred Rupees was paid to your Petitioner when the said Note of the twenty-sixth day of October one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four was about to become due from Funds belonging to the said Nabob.

That on the eighteenth of November one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four the said Misbah Oollah Khan again received from your Petitioner the sum of one thousand and five hundred Rupees on a Promissory Note executed by him and the said Ghoolam Mahomed for the purposes of the said Nabob, and that such sum was applied for the purposes of the said Nabob and the particulars of such expenditure were also entered in the said Moonshee Aykbass' Dufters of the Circar.

That such sum of one thousand and five hundred Rupees was paid to your Petitioner when the said Promissory Note of the eighteenth of November one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four became due from Funds belonging to the said Nabob.

That on the nineteenth December one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four, the said Misbah Oollah Khan again received from your Petitioner the sum of one thousand and five hundred Rupees on a Promissory Note executed by the said Misbah Oollah Khan and the said Ghoolam Mahomed for the purposes of the said Nabob, and that such sum was applied for the purposes of the said Nabob and the particulars of such expenditure were also entered in the said Moonshee Aykbass' Dufter of the Circar.

That in consequence of the affairs of the said Nabob having become embarrassed, the said last mentioned Promissory Note for Rupees one thousand and five hundred was not paid or taken up at maturity.

That the said Nabob of the Carnatic departed this life on the seventeenth of October one thousand eight hundred and fifty-five.

That your Petitioner filed his claim in the Supreme Court under the provisions of the Act XXX of one thousand eight hundred and fifty-eight, and in his particulars among other items claimed the said sum of one thousand and five hundred Rupees so due on the said Promissory Note of the nineteenth of December one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four as due by the said Nabob.

That on the hearing of your Petitioner's claim before the Supreme Court in consequence of your Petitioner not having established to the satisfaction of the said Court that the amount of the said Promissory Note for Rupees one thousand and five hundred so claimed by your Petitioner was payable by the Estate of the Nabob, the same was not allowed to him on such hearing.

That on the third September one thousand eight hundred and fifty-nine your Petitioner was advised to and did institute an action against the said Misbah Oollah Khan in the Supreme Court for the recovery of the amount of the said Promissory Note for Rupees one thousand and five hundred and that before such action was brought to a trial the said Misbah Oollah Khan filed a Bill in equity against your Petitioner praying amongst other things,

That the said Misbah Oollah Khan might be declared and decreed not to be personally liable to your Petitioner for payment of principal and interest so due on the said Promissory Note for Rupees one thousand and five hundred or any part thereof, and that your Petitioner might be restrained by the injunction of the Supreme Court from further proceeding with his said action at Law against the said Misbah Oollah Khan and from instituting or prosecuting any other action, suit or proceeding whatever against the said Misbah Oollah Khan in respect of the said Promissory Note.

That such proceedings were had on such Bill, that the same came on for hearing on the eighteenth day of May one thousand eight hundred and sixty, when the Supreme Court pronounced a Decree as prayed by the said Misbah Oollah Khan in his Bill, that is to say, that he was

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
18th February 1862.*

not personally liable to your Petitioner for the payment of the said Note for Rupees one thousand and five hundred, a copy of which Decree your Petitioner begs to enclose for your Excellency's information.

That by the last mentioned Decree declaring that the said Misbah Oollah Khan was not liable for the amount of the said Promissory Note your Petitioner is altogether debarred from recovering the amount of the said Promissory Note from the said Misbah Oollah Khan.

That your Petitioner has been informed that your Excellency in Council has awarded payments to be made to Mr. Richardson and Mahomed Abdool Kaulib for monies actually due by the late Nabob out of the General Treasury.

That your Petitioner has since the hearing of his claim collected the whole of the particulars hereinbefore mentioned, distinctly showing that the amount borrowed from your Petitioner was a bonâ fide loan to the said Nabob.

Your Petitioner therefore humbly prays your Excellency in Council that your Excellency will be pleased to reimburse to your Petitioner the amount of the principal and interest so due to him upon the said Promissory Note declared by the said Court to be payable by the Estate of the late Nabob in the same manner as was done under the Minutes of Consultation, No. 7 of fifth January one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and No. 274 of fifth June one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one.

For which act of justice your Petitioner shall ever pray &c.

Referred for the report of the Acting Government Solicitor.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

FORT SAINT GEORGE,
31st January 1862.

No. 42. From JOHN MILLER, Esq., Acting Government Solicitor; to the Honorable THOMAS PYCROFT, Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Madras, 6th February 1862, No. 80.

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Order of Government, noted in the margin, forwarding for my report the petition of Cassi Doss, Soucar, requesting the payment of the amount due to him by Misbah Oollah Khan Bahadoor on a certain Promissory Note for Rupees 1,500, dated 19th December 1854, and alleging that the amount had been borrowed from Cassi Doss for and on account of the late Nabob.

Dated 31st January 1862, and endorsed on Messrs. Ritchie and Shaw's letter to Government of the 29th idem.

2. Cassi Doss did prefer a claim under the provisions of Act XXX of 1858, against the Nabob's Estate in which he included this Note. The Government Agent reported on the Note as being entered in unaudited accounts lodged in "Treasury dated 19th December 1854," and the Law Officers of Government therefore determined to resist this portion of Cassi Doss' claim.

3. Upon the hearing the Court determined after full investigation that the item was inadmissible as against the Nabob's Estate and accordingly disallowed it with costs. Sir Adam Bingleston's observations with regard to this item will appear in the opinion of Mr. Advocate General which is herewith sent.

4. An action was subsequently (on the 3rd September 1859) commenced by Cassi Doss against Misbah Oollah Khan for the recovery of this very Note.

5. On the 29th of September 1859 the then Government Agent addressed Mr. Boyson on the subject and suggested that Cassi Doss' claim on the Note in question should under the circumstances be adjusted, with a view to save Misbah Oollah Khan from the annoyance and expense of the proceedings instituted against him by Cassi Doss, especially as he, Misbah Oollah Khan, was then in Madras on the requisition of Government for the purpose of affording valuable information on the Nabob's affairs, and on the 10th October 1859, the Advocate General advised with reference to the Government Agent's suggestions, that Government should not interfere as it was his, Cassi Doss', own fault in not having proved the claim under Act XXX of

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
18th February 1862.*

1858, that it was disallowed and recommended Misbah Oollah Khan's withdrawing his person from the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and returning to Hyderabad, as he was not in a position to afford any satisfactory aid to Government.

6. The Decree, a copy of which was forwarded with Cassi Doss' petition, declares that Misbah Oollah Khan is not personally liable for the payment of the Note and restrains Cassi Doss from further prosecuting Misbah Oollah Khan in respect of the Note; but Misbah Oollah Khan's costs were not allowed.

7. Upon this Misbah Oollah Khan applied to Government for reimbursement of the costs incurred by him in resisting the claim preferred against him, and which was again alleged to be properly due by the late Nabob.

See Order of Government, 15th October 1861 and Proceedings of Government 5th November 1861.

8. The Advocate General advised on this reference that the application should be refused and he also stated that Government would no doubt have been held liable by the Court, if Misbah Oollah Khan had been called, but that it was to Cassi Doss and not to Misbah Oollah Khan that the sum would have been awarded; and that therefore Cassi Doss would seem to have a stronger equitable claim to it than Misbah Oollah Khan.

9. It would not of course have followed even if Misbah Oollah Khan had been called that he would have proved this item for the claimant. Of Misbah Oollah Khan's ability to prove this item the Law Officers know nothing.

10. This is the position in which this matter stands; but I have thought it advisable to see the Advocate General upon the present reference, and that Officer has given the opinion of which I send you a copy.

11. I quite agree with the Advocate General that it is highly desirable not to open up claims which have been disposed of by the Court. But every rule has its exception and it is for Government to decide whether, in special cases, this course should not be departed from and whether the present case is one which should or should not be so considered.

12. I return the Order of Government under acknowledgment, together with the papers which accompanied it.

COPY—OPINION.

There has been hardly a claim tried under Act XXX of 1858 where the claimant failed in establishing the whole of his demand, that has not been followed by a series of petitions, amounting in short to praying that Government will treat the trial of the case and the Judgment of the Court as a nullity, and pay the items which the Court disallowed. I do submit that Government ought to consider the Judgment of the Court as final, otherwise why have sent the claims for trial there. It seems a sort of experiment, whether these Petitioners or Government will be tired first.

On the 17th May 1859, Mr. Justice Bittleston delivered his Judgment in this claim, and on the item of Rupees 1,500 now petitioned for, said as follows:

"As to the 5th item of Rupees 1,500, an entry in the claimant's Book shews payment to Misbah Oollah Khan of Rupees 1,500 in November 1854; but the Nabob's Dufters shew no entry of a Promissory Note for that amount, nor of any interest paid on that account. They only shew that, in November a lump sum of Rupees 14,500 was paid by Misbah Oollah Khan to Ghoolam Mahomed for the Nabob. Ghoolam Mahomed says, he never received money on the Promissory Note for Rupees 1,500. This Note first appears in the December Dufters. It is suggested by the claimant's Counsel, that this Note for Rupees 1,500 must have been given as security for part of the Rupees 14,500 already mentioned; but I cannot find in the Dufters any entries of Notes, which, along with the Rupees 1,500, will make up Rupees 14,500. It rests merely on suggestion. Misbah Oollah Khan must know the truth, but the claimant does not choose to call him; and it is suggested, by way of excuse, that he is hostile to Salar ool Moolk and Ghoolam Mahomed—but if so, why should that make him hostile to

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
18th February 1862.*

"the claimant? If the facts are as alleged by the claimant, Misbah Oollah Khan if called would only have to say that, in fact, he had *done right*. The claimant prefers *not* to call him, and to rest his claim to this item on *mere suggestion*."

The item was disallowed with costs.

The subsequent Equity Suit merely shews that Misbah Oollah Khan was not liable for this amount—the petition says *ergo* the Nabob must be liable. I cannot adopt his inference.

I know nothing of the Minutes of Consultation of the 5th January 1861, or of No. 274 of 5th June 1861, nor how they may affect the present petition. I can only add that I see no reason whatever for granting it, and that to do so would, in my opinion, be making a very dangerous precedent.

(Signed) THOMAS SYDNEY SMYTH,
Advocate General.

6th February 1862.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) JOHN MILLER,
Acting Government Solicitor.

No. 43. ORDER THEREON, 18th February 1862, No. 64.

Resolved, under the opinion given by the Advocate General in the matter of the claim referred to, that Cassi Doss be informed that the Government decline to comply with his application.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. F. Cartledge.

and that Officer has given the opinion of which,
I send you a Copy.

11. I quite agree with the Advocate General
that it is highly desirable not to open up Claims
which have been disposed of by the Court. But
every Rule has its exceptions and it is for Govern-
ment to decide whether, in special Cases, this
course should not be departed from and whether
the present Case is one which should or should not
be so considered.

12. I return the Order of Government under
acknowledgment together with the papers which
accompanied it and

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant,

Wm. Miller
Actg. Gov. To

There seems
no reason
why it should
The Advocate
General - who is
not an official
adviser of Govt
is not it
with our might
have called him
but would than
had he chosen
GPO

afford any satisfactory aid to Government.

6. The Decree a copy of which was forwarded with Cassi Doss' Petition declares that Misbah Collah Khan is not personally liable for the payment of the Note and restrains Cassi Doss from further prosecuting Misbah Collah Khan in respect of the Note, but Misbah Collah Khan's Costs were not allowed.

7. Upon this Misbah Collah Khan applied to Government for reimbursement of the Costs incurred by him in resisting the Claim preferred against him, and which was again alleged to be properly due by the late Nabob.

See Order of Government 15th October 1861. } 8. The Advocate General
and Proceedings of Govt. 5th November 1861. } advised on this reference that the application should be refused and he also stated that Government would no doubt have been held liable by the Court, if Misbah Collah Khan had been called but that it was to Cassi Doss and not to Misbah Collah Khan that the sum would have been awarded and that therefore Cassi Doss would seem to have a stronger equitable Claim to it than Misbah Collah Khan.

9. It would not of course have followed even if Misbah Collah Khan had been called that he would have proved this Item for the Claimant. Of Misbah Collah Khan's ability to prove this item the Law officers know nothing.

10. This is the position in which this matter stands; but I have thought it advisable to see the Advocate General upon the present reference

Copy Opinion.

There has been hardly a Claim tried under Act xxx of 1858 where the Claimant failed in establishing the whole of his demand, that has not been followed by a series of Petitions, amounting in short to praying that Government will treat the Trial of the Case and the Judgment of the Court as a nullity, and pay the Items which the Court disallowed. I do submit that Government ought to consider the Judgment of the Court as final - otherwise why have sent the Claims for trial there. It seems a sort of experiment, whether these Petitioners or Government will be tired first.

On the 17th May 1859, Mr. Justice Pittleson delivered his Judgment in this Claim, and on the item of Rupees 1500 now petitioned for, said as follows.

"As to the 5th Item, of Rupees 1500, an entry in the Claimant's Book shews payment to Misbah Collah Khan of Rupees 1500 in November 1854; but the Nabob's Duffters shew no entry of a Promissory Note for that amount, nor of any interest paid on that account. They only shew that, in November a lump sum of Rupees 14500 was paid by Misbah Collah Khan to Ghoolam Mahomed for the Nabob. Ghoolam Mahomed says, he never received money on the Promissory Note for Rupees 1500. This Note first appears in

in the December Dufters. It is suggested by the
"Claimant's Counsel, that this Note for Rupees 1500
"must have been given as security for part of the
"Rupees 14,500 already mentioned; but I cannot
"find in the Dufters any entries of Notes, which,
"along with the Rupees 1500, will make up Rupees
"14,500. It rests merely on suggestion. Misbah
"Collah Khan must know the truth, but the
"Claimant does not choose to call him; and it is
"suggested, by way of excuse, that he is hostile to
"Salar ool Moolk and Ghoolam Mahomed —
"but if so, why should that make him hostile to
"the Claimant? If the facts are as alleged by the
"Claimant, Misbah Collah Khan if called would only
"have to say that, in fact, he had done right — The
"Claimant prefers not to call him, and to rest his claim
"to this Item on mere suggestion."

The Item was disallowed with Costs.

The subsequent Equity Suit merely shews that
Misbah Collah Khan was not liable for this amount
the Petition says ergo the Nabob must be liable.
I cannot adopt his inference.

I know nothing of the Minutes of Consultation of
the 5th January 1861, or of No. 274 of 5th June 1861,
nor how they may affect the present Petition. I can only
add that I see no reason whatever for granting it,
and that to do so would, in my opinion, be making
a very dangerous precedent.

Respectfully
February 6th, 1862. Sydney Smyth
Adm. Genl. Secy.

/True Copy/

Wm. Miller
actg. Gov. Secy.

There was
in which
one of the

money
usage of the
Cano officers

N^o 2476 of 60

In the Supreme Court of Judicature at Madras
Vacations after the second Term one in
thousand eight hundred and fifty-

Present

The Honorable Sir Adam Riddleston Knight
one of Her Majesty's Justices.

Friday the eighteenth day of May one in
thousand eight hundred and fifty and in
the twenty third year of the Reign of Her
Majesty Queen Victoria.

Between Mibbah oollah Khan Bahadur Mostth
Azim Jung of Madras Mahomedan
Gentleman and a Carnatic stipendiary
Plaintiff
and
bapti Doff of Madras Lowcar.
Defendant

This Cause coming on this present day to be heard and
debated before the Supreme Court of Judicature at Madras in the
presence of Counsel learned on both sides. Upon opening the
Bill of Complaint exhibited by the above named Plaintiff and
the answer of the Defendant thereto and upon hearing read or
evidence for the said Plaintiff the following passages in the
answer of the said Defendant that is to say from the words
"I have been informed" in Para one to the words "property at
Hyderabad" at the end of such Para from the words "Shaver
been informed" in Para two to the words "Government of Madras"
at the end of such Para from the words "I do not know" in
Para three to the words "the Pargana Khana" at the end of such
Para from the words "I have been informed" in Para four to the
words "proceed to Hyderabad" in the same Para from the words
"I admit that" in Para twenty one to the words one thousand eight
hundred and fifty five "at the end of such Para from the words
"I admit that in Para twenty two to the words "Estate of the said
Nabob" in the same Para from the words "I admit that" in
Para twenty four to the words "this Honorable Court" in the
same Para from the words "I admit that" in the said Para in
twenty four to the words "and Interest thereon" in the same
Para from the words "I admit that" in Para twenty five to the
words "last mentioned Premisory Note" at the end of such Para
from the words "I admit that" in Para twenty six to the words
one thousand eight hundred and fifty "at the end of such
Para

To
James Dods' application to
Government for payment of
sum of Rs 1500, in
alleged to be due to him from
the Estate of the late Mibbah
of the Carnatic.

(Copy)
of Dods' application to
Government
No 1280

from
the Mibbah for delivery
of the same.

To the Chief Secretary
to Government - Madras

Dated, February 6th 1862.

Recd 1/6/28
12-64

Para from the words "I have been informed" in Para Twenty seven to the words "Plaintiff's said Particulars" in the same Para from the words "I admit that" in the said Para Twenty seven to the words "one thousand eight hundred and fifty nine" at the end of such Para from the words "I admit that" in Para Twenty eight to the words "to the Plaintiff" in the same Para from the words "I am informed" in Para Twenty nine to the words "one thousand eight hundred and fifty eight" in the same Para from the words "I admit that" in Para Thirty to the words "of this Honorable Court" at the end of such Para and from the words "I admit that" in Para Thirty one to the words "jurisdiction of this Honorable Court" in the same Para. and upon hearing read as evidence for the said Plaintiff the Particulars of the claim of Capi Doss in the matter of the Estate of the late Nabob of the Carnatic filed on the seventeenth day of December one thousand eight hundred and fifty eight. marked with the letter **A** and the Particulars of the claim of Mishah oollah Khan Bahadoor Moolthojim Sing in the matter of the Estate of the late Nabob of the Carnatic filed on the Twenty second day of February one thousand eight hundred and fifty nine is marked with the letter **B** and the Exhibits marked respectively with the letters **C D E F G** and **H** and Counsel for the said Defendant admitting at the Bar the orders of this Honorable Court made on the said two several claims of the said Capi Doss and Mishah oollah Khan Bahadoor Moolthojim Sing respectively in the matter of the Estate of the said late Nabob of the Carnatic and bearing dates respectively the seventeenth day of May one thousand eight hundred and fifty nine and the Twentieth day of September one thousand eight hundred and fifty nine and upon hearing the Examination and Cross examination *Viva Voce* of the said Plaintiff and of Narraissawmy a witness produced sworn and examined on behalf of the said Plaintiff and upon hearing the examination and Cross Examination *Viva Voce* of the said Defendant and of the following witnesses that is to say, Girdar Doss, Ristnasawmy and Ghoolam Mahomed severally produced sworn and examined on behalf of the said Defendant. Whereupon and upon debate of the matter and hearing what was alleged by the Counsel on both sides and upon mature Consideration this Court doth

Declare

7

Declare that the Plaintiff is not personally liable to the Defendant for the payment of the Principal and Interest of the joint and several Promissory Note in the Pleadings mentioned signed by the said Plaintiff and Ghoolam Mahomed in favor of the said Defendant and bearing date the nineteenth day of December one thousand eight hundred and fifty four for the sum of Rupees one thousand and five hundred /1500/ or any part thereof And this Court doth Order that a perpetual Injunction be granted against the Defendant to restrain him from further proceeding with his action at Law in the Bill mentioned against the said Plaintiff and from instituting or prosecuting any other action suit or proceeding whatsoever against the said Plaintiff in respect of the said last mentioned Promissory Note and from endorsing or negotiating the same And doth Decree the same accordingly without Costs and any of the Parties are to be at liberty to apply to this Court as they may be advised.

/signed/ J. E. Branson
Plt's Solr

By the Court
/signed/ William A. Lork
Registrar

Political Dept.
Proceedings of the Madras Govt.
Read the following pa.

per:

Petition from Cassidore
of Madras, Soucar.

(Dated 29th January, 1862)

From the Dy. Govt. Solicitor

(Dated 5th February 1862)

Order thereon 18th February 1862 No. 64.

Resolved, under the
opinion given by the Ad-
-vocate General in the (mat-
-ter of the claim referred to,
that Cassidore be inform-
ed that the Government
decline to comply with his

WM

WM

WM

Received 16th
May 1861

Cassidore

new

Black Collet

Black Collet

Call 1628
No 45